

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 26, 2005. Claims 1 to 46 are pending in the application, with Claims 47 to 52 having been canceled. Claims 1, 11, 21, 26, 31, 35, 39 and 43 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Before turning to the substantive merits of the Office Action, two formal matters will be addressed, a first involving applicant's claim to foreign priority, and the second involving the drawings.

With respect to Applicant's claim to priority, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to indicate that the certified copy of Applicant's priority document has been received. The certified copy was submitted to the patent office on June 21, 2001, but despite an acknowledgment (in the Office Action dated July 1, 2004) of Applicant's claim for foreign priority, there has not been an acknowledgment that the certified copy of the priority document has been received. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests an acknowledgment that the certified copy of the priority document has been received. This is a third request.

With respect to the drawings, it is respectfully requested for the Examiner to review and to approve the formal drawings that were filed with this application, on the original filing date of March 27, 2001.

Turning to the substantive merits of the Office Action, Claim 1 to 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,205 (Carcerano). Claims 47 to 52, which had been added in the previous amendment, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of the

rejection over Carcerano. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the remaining rejections are respectfully requested, for reasons that are explained more fully below.

The invention concerns the provision of a data list that displays data with regard to a plurality of records arranged in order for each record, based on a user designation of a data type to be displayed in the data list, and based on a user designation of a data type to be used as a display criterion. The records are displayed such that each is displayed with the type of data designated by the user in his first designation and is not displayed with the type of data not designated by the user in his first designation. However, the type of data designated by the user in his second designation is displayed even if it is not included in the type information designated by the user in his first designation.

Thus, the claims herein have been amended in keeping with the Examiner's comments found on page 7 of the Office Action. In particular, the claims have been amended to specify the identity of the person who performs designation steps (i.e, it is the user that performs the first and second designations). In addition, the claims have been amended to specifically state that the data types designated by the user are displayed whereas those that are not designated by the user are not displayed, excepting, of course, the situation where the second designation displays a data type that is not included in the first designation.

Carcerano has been reviewed, but it does not seem to disclose or to suggest the claimed first and second designations, much less that it is a user makes such first and second designations. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the §102(e) rejection over Carcerano should be withdrawn.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 104103v1